<u>REMARKS</u>

This Amendment is filed in response to the Final Office Action dated August 25, 2008, and with Request for Continued Examination (RCE) filed herewith on even date. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections presented therein. All rejections and objections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 – 14, 29, and 36 – 42 are now pending in this case.

Claims 1, 29, and 36 have been amended..

Election/Restriction

At page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner discusses the previous restriction of 2 Groups. The Examiner characterizes the Groups as,

Group 1: " Claims 1 – 14, 29, drawn to identification of online meetings, classified in class 709, subclass 204."

Group 2: "Claims 15 – 28. 30 – 35, drawn to transmission of telephonic signals to different types of networks, classified in class 370, subclass 260."

The Applicant acknowledges the previous election of Group 1 without traverse. Group 1 includes originally pending claims 1 – 14, and 29. Further, claims 26 – 42 are directed to Group 1.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

At pages 2 – 6 of the Office Action, claims 1 – 7, 12, 29, 36, 38, and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Rodman et al., U.S. Publication No. 2002/0103864 (hereinafter "Rodman") in view of Slobodin et al., U.S. Publication No. 2003/0072429 (hereinafter "Slobodin"), in further view of Watanabe et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,234,116 (hereinafter "Watanabe").

Applicant's claim 1, representative in part of the other rejected claims, sets forth (emphasis added):

1. A method for initiating an online meeting over a data network between a host party with a first computer and an attendee party with a second

6

computer, where a phone connection exists over a telephone network between a first phone of the host party and a second phone of the attendee party, the method comprising:

receiving a start meeting command at a first adaptor coupled to the first phone and the first computer;

in response to the first adaptor receiving the start meeting command, causing, by the first adaptor, the first computer to send a start meeting message over the data network to a data center;

receiving a meeting identification from the data center;

storing the meeting identification in a the first adaptor; and

transmitting the meeting identification from the first adaptor over the telephone network to a second adaptor, which is coupled to both the second phone and the second computer.

Rodman discloses a technique for initiating and conducting a data conference between a plurality of conference endpoints linked in communication by a network. *See* Rodman, Abstract. "To initiate a data conference, one of the participating conference endpoints sends a conference initiation request over the network to a conference server...Upon receipt of the conference initiation request, the conference server generates a conference code that uniquely identifies the data conference. The conference code is transmitted over the network to the requesting conference endpoint." *See* Rodman, paragraph 0012.

Slobodin discloses a "dataconferencing appliance [that] is connected to a data network that links the sites independently of the voice call network." *See* Slobodin, abstract. To establish a data communication session between local and remote sites, a user activates a conferencing appliance which uses its internal telephone adaptor 140 to begin an access negotiation procedure. *See* Slobodin, paragraph 0051. As part of the access negotiation procedure, a "network device access code is communicated by generating an audio signal representative of the network device access code and transmitting it within the voice call session. In response to receipt of the audio signal at the second site, the access negotiation procedure of the dataconference control unit at the second site uses its network interface module and the received network device access code to join a data communication session between the sites via the data network...." *See* Slobodin, paragraph 0011.

7

Watanabe discloses a communication system that transmits an animated character and its action from a transmitting side to a receiving side. *See* Watanabe, column 2, lines 37 – 40. The designated character performs the designated action on the screen of the receiving side. *See* Watanabe, column 2, lines 40 – 41. Further, "there is provided a communications system comprising a plurality of user terminals capable of communication using a predetermine communication software program and accessible to Internet..." *See* Watanabe, column 4, line 65 – column 5, line 2. Figure 7 discloses a flowchart of a procedure for starting up the communication software on a particular terminal. A user gives an instruction to the particular terminal to establish a connection to the Internet and to establish an "OnNet" status. *See* Watanabe, column 13, lines 6 – 19 and Figure 7.

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Rodman, Slobodin, and Watanabe does not teach or suggest Applicant's claimed *"in response to the first adaptor receiving the start meeting command, causing, by the first adaptor, the first computer to send a start meeting message over the data network to a data center."*

In Applicant's system, a first adaptor is coupled to a first computer. When the first adaptor receives a start meeting command, the first adaptor causes (e.g., triggers) the first computer coupled to it to send a start meeting message over the data network to a data center. Said differently, the Applicant receives a start meeting command at a first entity, an adaptor, which then causes a completely different entity, a computer (coupled to the adaptor), to send a start meeting command to a data center.

In contrast, the local conference endpoint in Rodman is not connected to a separate adaptor or entity, as is claimed by Applicant. Instead, Rodman discloses a system where one unit, the local conference endpoint, performs all the operations necessary to initiate a data conference, rather than interacting with other devices. *See* Rodman, paragraph [0012]. That is, the local conference endpoint is the entity that receives the initiation request (by depressing a single key) and is also the same entity that sends any requests to a conference server. *See* Rodman, paragraph [0012] and Fig. 2. Accordingly, Rodman does not teach or suggest Applicant's claimed *"in response to the first adaptor*

receiving the start meeting command, <u>causing, by the first adaptor, the first computer</u>
to send a start meeting message over the data network to a data center."

The deficiencies of Rodman are not remedied by combination with Slobodin. In Slobodin, a dataconference appliance (Fig. 1, 112) is connected directly to a voice network (146) and a data network (132). The data conference appliance identifies a network access code that is then communicated to another data conference appliance (122) via the voice network (132). Eventually, a data communication session between the two data conference appliances (112, 122) may be established using the data network (132). While a computer (116) may be connected to a data conferencing appliance (112), it is not caused, by the data conference appliances, ***to send a start meeting message over the data network to a data center***. Instead, Slobodin envisions the computer to operate as an "image source" (*see* paragraph 0048) that supplies frames of image data to be viewed in the conference. Therefore, as the computer that is connected to the data conference appliance in Slobodin does not send any start meeting message to a data center, Slobodin may not fairly be interpreted as teaching "***in response to the <u>first adaptor</u> receiving the start meeting command, <u>causing, by the first adaptor, the first computer</u> to send a start meeting message over the data network to a data center***."

Moreover, the deficiencies in Rodman and Slobodin are not remedied by the combination with Watanabe. The Examiner suggests that Watanabe teaches Applicant's claimed novel "***in response to the <u>first adaptor</u> receiving the start meeting command, <u>causing, by the first adaptor, the first computer</u> to send a start meeting message over the data network to a data center***" at column 12, line 63 – column 13, line 40 of Watanabe. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. The cited text of Watanabe does not disclose receiving a start meeting at a first entity, an adaptor, and then that adaptor causing a second entity, a computer, to send a start meeting message as is claimed by the Applicant. Instead, Watanabe discloses a system where a user terminal receives input from a user, and then that same user terminal sends a signal to the communication software. That is, the user terminal is the entity that receives the input and is also the same entity that sends requests to a communication software. Accordingly, Watanabe does not

teach or suggest the Applicant's claimed novel "*in response to the first adaptor receiving the start meeting command, causing, by the first adaptor, the first computer to send a start meeting message over the data network to a data center.*"

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Rodman, Slobodin and Watanabe is legally insufficient to render the present claims unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103 because of the absence in Rodman and Slobodin of Applicant's claimed "*in response to the first adaptor receiving the start meeting command, causing, by the first adaptor, the first computer to send a start meeting message over the data network to a data center.*"

At pages 6 – 7 of the Office Action, claims 8 – 11, 13 – 14, 39, and 41 – 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Rodman in view of Slobodin in further view of Lee et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,959,072 (hereinafter "Lee").

Claims 8 – 11, 13 – 14, 39, and 41 – 42 are dependent claims that depend from independent claims believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, claims 8 – 11, 13 – 14, 39, and 41 – 42 are believed to be in condition for allowance for this as well as other separate reasons.

At page 8 of the Office Action, claim 37 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Rodman in view of Slobodin in further view of Watanabe, in further view of Office Notice.

Claim 37 is a dependent claim that depends from an independent claim believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, claim 37 is believed to be in condition for allowance for this as well as other separate reasons.

Should the Examiner believe a telephonic interview would be helpful in the disposition of this Application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned attorney at (617) 951-2500.

In summary, all independent claims are believed to be in condition for allowance and therefore all dependent claims that depend there from are believed to be in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests favorable action.

Please charge any additional fee occasioned by this paper to our Deposit Account No. 03-1237.

Respectfully submitted,

_/James A. Blanchette/_____
James A. Blanchette
Reg. No. 51,477
CESARI AND MCKENNA, LLP
88 Black Falcon Avenue
Boston, MA 02210-2414
(617) 951-2500